



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

iyu  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,405	07/11/2003	Qingqi Chen	30610/30004	5534
4743	7590	12/14/2004	EXAMINER	
<b>MARSHALL, GERSTEIN &amp; BORUN LLP</b> 6300 SEARS TOWER 233 S. WACKER DRIVE CHICAGO, IL 60606				KOSAR, ANDREW D
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1654		

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/618,405	CHEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Andrew D Kosar	1654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM  
 THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 1-56 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-56 are pending and require Restriction to one invention.

### *Election/Restrictions*

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 26-46 and 49-56, drawn to bioconjugates of the generic formula A-  
 $X^1\text{-C(O)NH-R-NH-C(O)-X}^2\text{-B}$  and pharmaceutical compositions thereof,  
classified in various classes and subclasses, wherein one embodiment is  
classified in class 530, subclass 391.7.
- II. Claims 1-25, drawn to a method of making the bioconjugates of Group I,  
classified in various classes and subclasses, wherein one embodiment is  
classified in class 530, subclass 391.7.
- III. Claims 47 and 48, drawn to a method of treating a subject with the  
bioconjugate compositions of Group I, classified in various classes and subclasses,  
wherein one embodiment is classified in class 530, subclass 391.7. The inventions are  
distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The  
inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the  
process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2)  
that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process  
(MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the products, bioconjugates, can be prepared  
through a different process wherein the active agent moiety (A) is synthesized *de novo*

on the conjugate from single amino acids, rather than through the step of conjugation of the 'complete' active agent moiety to the linker group.

Inventions I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the process 'treating a subject' with an undefined condition and/or disease state can be accomplished with any of a myriad of distinct compounds. One could treat a subject by administration of water, as necessary for thirst, hygienic necessity, or irrigation of a wound. One could also treat a subject by administration of caffeine to treat drowsiness.

Inventions II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions the function of Group II is to make compounds, while the function of Group III is to 'treat a subject'. One would not have to practice the invention of Group III to practice the invention of Group II, nor would one have to necessarily practice the invention of Group II to practice the invention of Group III.

The search for each of the above inventions is not co-extensive particularly with regard to the non-patented literature search. A reference which would anticipate the invention of one group would not necessarily anticipate or even make obvious another

group. For example, the search of the compound(s) would not necessarily lead to the discovery of art relevant to the method(s) of use.

Additionally, the compounds of the instant application are distinct, absent evidence to the contrary, and would require a unique search strategy. The search for the distinct compounds is conducted based on their chemical structure. Therefore, the search of one chemical structure would not necessarily lead to the discovery of another structure, nor would it necessarily lead to the discovery of methods of using and/or making.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search for one invention would not necessarily lead to the discovery of another invention, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper, and to not restrict would be an undue burden on the Examiner.

***Election of Species***

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: The claims are drawn to a myriad of bioconjugates of the generic formula: A-X<sup>1</sup>-C(O)NH-R-NH-C(O)-X<sup>2</sup>-B.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, all claims are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim

is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

In order to effect a complete response to this restriction requirement, Applicant is required to elect a single disclosed species for each element (A, X<sup>1</sup>, X<sup>2</sup>, R, B) such that a single compound is identified [Note: A generic formula or R-group (i.e.- substituted alkylene, drug, agent, etc.) may NOT be elected as drawn to the elected invention because no meaningful search can be conducted without an undue burden, due to the myriad of potential substitutions and/or compounds possible in each instance]. For example, Applicants may elect the compound (product) of Scheme 2 (page 58).

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

### ***Inventorship***

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

***Rejoinder Practice***

The Examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

**NO CLAIMS ARE ALLOWED.**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew D. Kosar whose telephone number is (571)272-0913. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8am-430pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell can be reached on (571)272-0974. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Andrew D. Kosar, Ph.D.  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1654



Bruce A. Campbell

BRUCE A. CAMPBELL, III  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600